11 June 2003

ORIGINAL



•



Director of Utilities

Arizona Corporation Commission
Reference pending decision on Pine Water Company rate increase:
1200 W. Washington St.
Phoenix AZ85007

To Whom It May Concern:

I will make this short and to the point. I bear no particular hostility toward Bob Hardcastle and his water company, but in reference to the rate increase and other changes proposed by Pine Water Company, two points should be made and a couple of important questions need to be asked.

<u>First point</u>: Bob Hardcastle has (a) asked for a monthly assessment for "exploration" and (b) publicly (and recently) stated that Pine and Strawberry will "always" have water problems because there "is no aquifer" beneath them. Am I wrong or are these two statements logically inconsistent? Why should we pay an assessment for exploration when the person asking for the assessment flatly states that there is no water to be found? Before you approve this assessment, please make the man specify exactly how he plans to spend our money.

<u>Second point</u>: An expensive test hole was drilled in Strawberry some time back. It was dry for about a thousand feet. Somewhat deeper it came upon four hundred feet of water which was tested and approved for drinking. On a scale of one to ten, this test hole was given an eight. No attempt has ever been made to develop this water. The excuse given is that one unsupported hydrologist "thinks it may be" ground water. If Hardcastle wants money for exploration and development, he should not get it unless he agrees to first develop the one and only <u>proven</u> potential resource we have.

Questions: So far, since the approval of new conservation guidelines, the stages in Pine have changed in what appears to be a straightforward, honest, and logical manner. As Memorial Day approached we went to Stage 2, then 3, then 4, then 5, then back to 2 in about three days. This is consistent with the number of wells, the capacity of the pumps, and the size of the storage tanks. It is <u>not</u> consistent with what we have seen in the past, when every thinking resident of Pine has had reason to suspect that someone was playing games with stage numbers for reasons too obvious to bother going into. So, here are the questions: Do you folks require Brooke Utilities to show you hardcore data to support changes in stages? Do you make surprise inspections to verify that data? If not, could you do that?

Thank you for your time.

Yours,

Tom Garrett P.O. Box 1026

Pine. AZ 85544

cc: Ron Christensen, Gila County Supervisor

DOCCHMENT CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

20 :11 A PI NUL (005

JUN 1 9 2003

BECEINED



W-03512A-03-0279

Governor Janet Napolitano Arizona Corporation Commission Pine Water Company Gila County

June 4, 2003

Gentlemen,

This letter is addressed to all involved in decisions regarding Pine's water problems. My husband is the pastor of Mountain Bible Church in Payson. I am a small business owner in Pine. We both reside full time in Pine.

I received the five page letter from Brook Utilities and would like to offer some comments. Reading this letter gave me a sinking feeling. First, I would like to comment on Gila County and the authorization of continued water hook-ups. I heard that a meeting held in Phoenix was attended by part-time Pine people from the valley. As would be expected these folks put pressure on to issue more water meters. I feel that if this meeting had been in Pine a great many people would have attended and expressed themselves as against such an action. This kind of decision may give Gila county more money but those who live here full time pay the price of having to live under restrictions and insufficient supply of water. When second home owners are here we always see significant restrictions.

Secondly, the Corporation commission has now authorized another increase for Brooks Utilities water rates. The increase is ostensibly to support water hauling when we run dry. This raises a couple of issues. Will we receive a rebate at the end of the year if there is no need to haul water? Also, the forty percent increase which was incurred three years ago came with the promise that new sources of water would be provided. We did have access to the Strawberry pipeline, but when our greatest need occurred last July we were cut off. We have a lot of older people in Pine. When we were out of water many of them were physically unable to carry water home. So this increase really does not solve our problem.

I look around at the new housing subdivisions like Portals, Strawberry Hollow, and Solitude Trails and see that these wealthier developments were allowed to purchase or lease wells which then drain the water table for the rest of us who are dependent on Brooks Utilities. Was Gila County responsible for these decisions?

Finally, I am angered by the enforcement for Stage 4 water restrictions on page three of Brooks' letter. I see the lots along the Beeline in town flooded with water. The subdivisions listed above are not forced to abide by these restrictions, thus we have a situation where we must cut back and refrain from watering a single fruit tree, while others can continue to waste water. I do not understand a government agency that allows such inequality.

In the face of such inequity we have decided to move and I may have to close down my business.

The closing of the forest, dead trees and water issues create a great financial strain for anyone trying to run a business in Pine. I feel that the poor management and decision-making which has taken place over the last four or five years in respect to Pine has contributed to the circumstance in which we find ourselves today. I believe that I am not to put my trust in man but in the God who sends rain and promises to provide for the needy. But man does have a responsibility to make decisions and act according to the principles of justice and equity. For this we will be held accountable.

Please consider this letter as you make decisions for our town.

Sincerely

Patricia Greiner